

REMARKS**Status of Claims**

Claims 1-5 were pending in the application. Claims 6, 15 and 19 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Therefore, claims 6-19 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Interview at PTO:

Applicant's representative greatly appreciates the courtesies extended to him by Examiner Ghandi and Examiner Torres during a personal interview conducted at the PTO on November 16, 2006, in which claims 6 and 7 were discussed, and in which it was agreed that those claims distinguish over the cited art of record.

Claim Objections:

In the Office Action, claims 6, 15 and 19 were objected to because of minor informalities noted on page 2 of the Office Action. Claims 6, 15 and 19 have been amended to correct those minor informalities.

Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,883,844 to So (hereafter "So") in view of U.S. patent 6,473,873 to Akamatsu et al. (hereafter "Akamatsu"). Claims 9, 10, 11, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over So and Akamatsu as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,668,815 to Gittinger et al. (Hereafter "Gittinger"). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over So and Akamatsu as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Japanese patent publication JP 200200200A to Matshushita. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

As is clear from the description in column 11, lines 33-43 of Akamatsu, Input/Output lines I/O0 to I/O7 are used to provide a test pattern to be stored in a Memory Array MA,

whereby address lines A00 to A10 are used to provide respective addresses in which the test pattern is stored in the Memory Array MA. This is clearly much different from the features recited in claim 6 whereby a first external terminal is shared to receive serially the test pattern data and the address data. In Akamatsu, on the other hand, the internal bus TMI is used to provide the test data pattern to be stored in the Memory Array MA, as described in column 11, line 66 to column 12, line 12 of that reference. The address lines A00 to A10 are used to provide the addresses to store the test pattern data (provided by the internal bus TMI) in the memory array MA. Thus, no external terminal that receives serially test pattern data and address data is taught or suggested by Akamatsu.

Since So does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Akamatsu, as admitted in the Office Action, independent claim 6 is patentable over the combined teachings of those two references.

Independent claim 15 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 6, and thus that claim is also patentable over the combined teachings of So and Akamatsu.

The dependent claims are patentable for the specific features recited in those claims, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claim. For example, claim 7 recites a selection register that stores selection data indicating which of the test pattern register and the address register receives data from a first external terminal. The Office Action incorrectly asserts that column 6, lines 14-18 of So teaches these features. Rather, unlike the features recited in claim 7 in which both test pattern data and address data are provided by way of an external terminal in which a selection register stores selection data indicative of what type of data is currently being input via the external terminal, column 6, lines 14-18 of So merely describes a multiplexing means 38 that multiplexes generated address bits and generated data bits, whereby no selection data indicating the type of data currently being output from the multiplexing means is taught or suggested by this portion of So.

Accordingly, dependent claim 7 is patentable for these additional reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested. The

Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 20, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola
Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819
Attorney for Applicant